



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/819,729

03/29/2001

Hironori Yahagi

826.1721

4351

21171

7590

07/03/2008

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

SUITE 700

1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/03/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/819,729	Applicant(s) YAHAGI, HIRONORI	
	Examiner CESAR B. PAULA	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 4/23/2008.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claim 10 has been canceled. Claims 1-9, and 11-14 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1, 3-7, and 9-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanevsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6300947 B1; 10/9/2001; filed 7/6/1998), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 2, and 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky, in view of DeRose (6105044) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. The rejection of claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the cancellation of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky (U.S. Pat. No. 6300947 B1; 10/9/2001; filed 7/6/1998), in view of the instant specification.

Regarding independent claim 1, Kanevsky discloses the adaptation of HTML webpage documents, which contains hierarchical nested elements, such as text image, etc. (col.1, line 57-67, col.8, lines 16-34, fig. 6-7)-- *a document inputting device inputting information of a structured document that is written with a set of hierarchical elements, and composed of a plurality of records each including one text element or more.*

Furthermore, Kanevsky discloses generating a stripped version of the webpage, to be displayed on a smaller screen device (col.10, lines 36-65, fig.10-16). Textual data located about the same position from the beginning or root of the document, such as “YAHOO” and “News”, is combined to recreate a condensed version of the webpage with relatively the same position of two combined words, thereby decreasing the space occupied by the words, while preserving some of the words found in the original document--*a joining device generating a new text element by combining contents of text elements relatively with a same path from a root among two records or more of the structured document or a generating device generating a new record*

that includes the new element and inherits a relative position relationship of elements in two records or more; a converting device converting the structured document by replacing the two records or more with the new record, thereby decreasing the number of hierarchical elements of the structured document and preserving text element information of the records. Kanevsky does not explicitly disclose calculating, a tree structure of a document object model of the structured document, obtaining a list of text elements linked to a text element from the tree structure obtaining text elements having a same element name successively appear in the list as text elements relatively with a same path from a root among two records or more of the structured document. The instant specification teaches the expansion of an XML document in memory as a DOM tree structure. The tree maps a document element list to other text elements in the document, which are located about the same location in the tree (page 4, lines 16-page 6, lines; col. 15, line 25, fig. 1G). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kanevsky and the specification, because would provide reliability and flexibility when splitting up the web page.

Regarding independent claim 3, Kanevsky discloses the adaptation of HTML webpage documents stored on a computer, which contains hierarchical nested elements, such as text image, etc. (col.1, line 57-67, col.8, lines 16-34, col.5, lines 20-67, fig. 6-7)-- *a document inputting device inputting information of a structured document written with a set of hierarchical elements; a storing device storing the information of the structured document;*

Furthermore, Kanevsky discloses generating a stripped version of the webpage, to be displayed on a smaller screen device (col.10, lines 36-65, col.11, lines 1-67, col.15, lines 1-36,

Art Unit: 2178

fig. 7, 10-16). One textual data is located below another piece of text, such as “Business” and “Technology”; these words are combined to create a condensed version of the webpage with relatively the same position of two combined words. Unnecessary data is removed from the output document, thereby decreasing the space occupied by the words. Other words located down the first line of the document where joined words are, are copied exactly, such as “World”, “Health”, while preserving some of the words found in the original document (1502, fig.13)-- *a joining device having a same element name successively appear in the second list as a second combination of elements, as a first combination of elements that successively exist side by side in a level immediately, generating a plurality of new text elements by combining, as synthesis targets, content of each element included in the first combination of elements, and content of each element included in the second combination of elements, wherein elements in each level on a route from the elements of the first combination to the certain level have a same element name to each other, so that a text relationship between the combined contents can be preserved; a generating device generating a synthesized substructure that includes the plurality of new text elements, and inherits a relative position relationship of original elements among the plurality of new text elements; a duplicating device generating a duplication of an unjoined element below a new element included in a synthesized substructure generated from an element higher than the unjoined element; a deleting device deleting an unnecessary original element; a converting device converting the structured document into a structured document of a synthetic type configured by a synthesized substructure by using said joining device, said generating device, said duplicating device, and said deleting device, thereby decreasing the number of hierarchical elements of the structured document and preserving text element information of records; and a*

Art Unit: 2178

document outputting device outputting the structured document of the synthetic type. Kanevsky fails to explicitly teach calculating a tree structure of a document object model of the structured document, obtaining a first list of text elements linked to a certain text element from the tree structure, obtaining text elements having a same element name successively appear in the first list below the certain text element in the structured document, obtaining a second list of text elements linked to a text element lower than the certain text element from the tree structure, obtaining text elements having which are in a certain level lower than the elements of the first combination. The instant specification teaches the expansion of an XML document in memory as a DOM tree structure. The tree contains a first node list element with a list of text elements linked to the node list. A second node list contains text element linked to the node list element which is lower than the first node list (page 4, lines 16-page 6, lines; col. 15, line 25, fig. 1G). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kanevsky and the specification, because would provide reliability and flexibility when splitting up the web page.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Kanevsky discloses generating a stripped version of the webpage, to be displayed on a smaller screen device (col.10, lines 36-65, col.15, lines 1-36, fig. 7, 10-16). One textual data is located below another piece of text, such as “Business” and “Technology”; these words are combined to create a condensed version of the webpage with relatively the same position of two combined words, in a case where the words are not combined by reside separately--*generating the synthesized substructure if a combination of elements that*

successively exist side by side and have a same element name in two levels or more on the route to the certain level is not found.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Kanevsky discloses generating a stripped version of the webpage, to be displayed on a smaller screen device (col.10, lines 36-65, col.11, lines 1-67, fig. 7, 10-16). Elements, such as links, icons, etc. are separated into groups, and then combined based on the size of the group to be combined.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Kanevsky discloses generating a stripped version of the webpage, to be displayed on a smaller screen device, by combining words using characters, such as “&” (col.10, lines 36-65, col.11, lines 1-67, col.15, lines 1-36, fig. 13). -- *generating contents of the new elements by inserting a delimiter between the two joined contents.*

Regarding dependent claim 7, Kanevsky discloses generating a stripped version of the webpage, to be displayed on a smaller screen device, by combining words using characters, such as “&” (col.10, lines 36-65, col.11, lines 1-67, col.15, lines 1-36, fig. 7, 13). In other words, when the words are combined the character is added where it is not found to indicated relatedness to the same group -- *consecutively inserting the delimiter in the contents of new elements if content of an element which becomes the synthesis target is lacking.*

Regarding independent claims 12 and 13, the claims reflect the methods for performing the operations of claim 3 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claims 9, 11 and 14, the claims reflect the computer-readable storage medium on which is recorded a program, a converting apparatus and a method for performing the operations of claim 1 and are rejected along the same rationale.

8. Claim 2, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of the instant specification, and further in view of DeRose (6105044, 8/2000).

This rejection is made in light of the 35 USC 112 1st parag. rejections above.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Kanevsky discloses generating a stripped version of the webpage, to be displayed on a smaller screen device, by combining words using characters, such as “&” (col.10, lines 36-65, col.11, lines 1-67, col.15, lines 1-36, fig. 13). Kanevsky does not disclose *a key inputting device inputting a search key or searching device searching the structured document after being converted, extracting a character string corresponding to a position of a detected character string from contents of an element in a certain record when the character string corresponding to the search key is detected from contents of another element in the certain record, restoring a record before being converted, which includes the search key, from the detected character string and the extracted character string, and outputting the restored record as a search result.* DeRose teaches inputting a search key (col. 13, lines 34-37; col. 15, lines 29-35) and searching the document, extracting a string corresponding to a position of a

Art Unit: 2178

detected string from contents of an element in a certain record when the string corresponding to the search key is detected from contents of another element in the certain record, restoring a record from the detected character string and the extracted character string, and outputting the restored record as a search result (col. 13, lines 34-37, 47-67; col. 14, lines 1-48; col. 17, lines 60-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kanevsky and DeRose before him at the time the invention was made, to modify document conversion as taught by Kanevsky to include search keys as taught by DeRose, because of all the reasons taught by DeRose, including to allow users to navigate readily an electronic document and to manipulate such document in an efficient manner (col.2, lines 35-67).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Kanevsky discloses generating a stripped version of the webpage, to be displayed on a smaller screen device, by combining words using characters, such as “&” (col.10, lines 36-65, col.11, lines 1-67, col.15, lines 1-36, fig. 13). Kanevsky does not disclose *a key inputting device inputting a search key or a searching device comparing a character string between two delimiters, which is included in contents of elements within the structured document of the synthetic type, with a character string of the search key, obtaining an order of a delimiter preceding a character string corresponding to the search key when the character string corresponding to the search key is detected from contents of elements within a certain synthesized substructure, extracting a character string between a delimiter corresponding to the order and a next delimiter in contents of another element in the certain synthesized substructure, restoring a corresponding portion of the structured document before being converted from the detected character string and the extracted character string, and*

outputting the restored portion as a search result. DeRose teaches inputting a search key (col. 13, lines 34-37; col. 15, lines 29-35) and comparing a string between two delimiters with a string of the search key, obtaining an order of a delimiter preceding a string corresponding to the search key when the string corresponding to the search key is detected, extracting a string between a delimiter corresponding to the order and a next delimiter(word tag) in contents of another element (the end document tag)in the substructure, restoring a corresponding portion of the structured document before being converted from the detected and extracted strings, and outputting the restored portion as a search result (col. 13, lines 34-37, 47-67; col. 14, lines 1-48; col. 17, lines 60-62; col. 18, lines 60-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Kanevsky and DeRose before him at the time the invention was made, to modify document conversion as taught by Kanevsky to include search keys and delimiters as taught by DeRose, because of all the reasons taught by DeRose, including to allow users to navigate readily an electronic document and to manipulate such document in an efficient manner (col.2, lines 35-67). This would allow the quick search and efficient formatting of data requested by a user, having limited resources, and found in a document.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 4/23/2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection above. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant states that Kanevsky does not teach or suggest the newly added limitation of calculating a tree structure of a

document object model (page 9, parag.4). The Applicant is directed towards the rejection of the amended claim as necessitated by the amendment.

Claims 12-14 and their new amendment have been rejected above in light of the new grounds of rejections required by the amendment.

Claims 2-8 are rejected at least based on the same reasons found above.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hind et al. (Pat. # US 6941511 B1).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2178

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 or 571 272-1000 (USA or Canada).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

	/CESAR B PAULA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
--	--

7/3/2008